

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the office action mailed December 2, 2004, by the present amendment claims 1, 2 and 4-18.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 9 AND 14

The examiner objected to claims 9 and 14 stating that it appeared there was a grammatical error in each of these claims with regard to certain language used therein. In response thereto, minor amendments have been made in each of claims 9 and 14 which are believed to obviate any grounds of misunderstanding as to the wording of the claim. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(B)

Claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Haugli et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,279). Merely in the interest of expediting prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 3. It is believed that this amendment obviates this ground for rejection and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

AMENDMENTS TO REMAINING CLAIMS

Various minor amendments have been made to various ones of the remaining claims to either change the dependency of the claim or to implement minor wording changes that improve the overall readability of the claim. These amendments should not be construed as narrowing amendments.

NEW DRAWING SUBMITTED FOR FIGURE 1

A complete set of formal drawings is being filed with this amendment. Reference numeral "10" was inadvertently omitted in the original drawing sheet for Figure 1, that was submitted with the application upon filing. No new matter has been added to the drawings.

CONDITIONAL ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIMS 3, 4 AND 6-8

Claims 3, 4 and 6-8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the examiner indicated these claims would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As noted, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 3. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Claim 6 and 8 each depended from claim 5, which in turn depends from claim 1. It is believed that all of the remaining pending claims that depend from independent claim 1 are also in form for allowance at this time.

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the conditional allowance of claims 9-13 and 15, provided the claims are amended to remove the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Very minor amendments have been made to these claims, and principally to claims 9 and 14, as noted hereinbefore, to improve the overall readability of the claims and to remove any possible ambiguity as to any of the limitations recited in these claims. It is believed that the ground for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been removed and reconsideration is requested.

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 14 and 16-18.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant(s) have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 9, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/jo